REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,222,550 (Rosman et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,557,083 (Sperber et al.).

Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 9 has been amended to include claims 10 and 11. Claim 17 has been amended to include claims 18 and 19. Accordingly, these are amendments as to form since these claims were previously pending. This is a new ground of rejection. As to claims 3, 11 and 19 (portions of or all of which are now incorporated into independent claims), it is alleged that Rosman teaches a setup unit for directing a geometry into one of multiple parallel pipelines wherein the geometry is determined to <u>locate in a portion of an output screen defined by a tile</u>. The office action cites Rosman at column 5, lines 64-68. However, the cited portion actually refers to a different "tile" and is actually referring to the use of a scoreboard which is used as noted in columns 3, 4 and 5 of Rosman, to determine whether a particular pipeline has already processed a particular pixel and if so, the other pipeline is then stalled until completion of the pixel generation occurs. Each pipeline compares each new pixel with a valid pixel address in the other pipeline's scoreboard table. As such, the "tile" referred to in column 5 refers to a tile in a scoreboard indicating already processed pixels that are used to determine whether another pipeline needs to be stalled. There is no screen tile used or contemplated by the cited portion to determine which pipeline is used to process a particular geometry.

Applicants' claim is directed to a completely different operation than the cited portion of Rosman. The claims utilize a determination of whether or not geometry is <u>initially</u> provided to a pipeline, and only if the primitive is located in a particular portion of an <u>output screen</u> tile. For example, the parallel pipelining operation as claimed uses, in one example, a setup unit (see new

claim 25) that, for example, is used in part to determine which pipeline a primitive gets sent to depending upon whether or not the primitive is to be displayed on a particular screen location and in more particular, a particular screen tile. For example, a screen may be divided into two tiles if there are two parallel pipelines. A screen might be divided into four tiles if there are four pipelines. Each pipeline is assigned primitives that correspond to the screen tile. As such, Applicants claim a screen tile based parallel pipeline operation.

In contrast, Rosman describes a primitive based parallel pipeline operation where each pipeline takes in a different primitive and the next primitive that is available for rendering is passed to the pipeline that is available. No screen tile based setup operation is described in the cited portion and as such, the claims are in condition for allowance. (See also Applicants' Specification, pages 10-12).

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 7, 2007

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 609-7599
FAX: (312) 609-5005